

Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966; thence along the center line of said Road Easement No. 18, South 00°06'37" West, 416.95 feet to the most Northerly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Thomas Hunter McManus, Sr., et ux, recorded July 5, 1966 as File/Page No. 109648 and being the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said center line South 00°06'37" West, 732.05 feet (deed - 732.04 feet) to the beginning of a tangent 1000.00 foot radius curve, concave Northwesterly; and Southeasterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 02°44'56" a distance of 17.98 feet to Southwesterly corner of said McManus' land, thence along the boundary of said land as follows: South 76°52'17" East, 528.31 feet to the Southeasterly corner of said land; North 01°49'58" West, 625.32 feet to an angle point therein; and North 60°47'23" West, 563.51 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 3 (73-0420):

Those portions of Lots 3, 4, 9 and 10 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Easterly prolongation of the center line of Road Easement No. 19 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966, being also the Northeasterly corner of land described as Parcel 184, in Quitclaim Deed to Donald E. Goodell, et ux, recorded March 29, 1967 as File/Page No. 42360; thence along said prolongation and said center line of Road Easement Parcel 19 as follows: North 88°19'42" West, 100.9 feet (deed - 100.91 feet) to the beginning of a tangent 300.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly; Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 70°21'57", a distance of 368.43 feet; tangent to said curve, South 21°18'21" West, 709.62 feet to the beginning of a tangent 500.00 foot radius curve, concave Northwesterly; and Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 17°31'30", a distance of 152.94 feet to the most Westerly corner of said Parcel 184 of Goodell's land; thence along the boundary of said Parcel 184 as follows:

South 28°27'31" East, 568.72 feet to the Southwesterly corner of said land; thence South 39°19'09" West, 678.62 feet; thence South 44°28'28" West, 385.39 feet; thence South 80°00'26" East, 391.23 feet; thence South 04°00'57" West, 263.36 feet to the intersection of the center line of Easement No. 1 with the Southwesterly prolongation of the center line of Easement No. 13 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 465, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 15, 1965, being also the most Southerly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Donald E. Goodell, et ux, recorded

September 13, 1965 as File/Page No. 165829; thence along said prolongation and said center line North $48^{\circ}59'34''$ East, 479.20 feet to an angle point in the boundary of said Goodell's land last above referred to; thence along said boundary as follows: North $00^{\circ}27'12''$ East, 666.50 feet to a corner therein; North $89^{\circ}11'37''$ West, 39.83 feet to a corner therein; North $00^{\circ}00'22''$ East, 1380.00 feet to an angle point therein; and North $74^{\circ}06'28''$ West, 131.04 feet to the center line of said Easement No. 1; thence along said center line North $11^{\circ}40'18''$ East, 218.66 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 4 (73-0414):

That portion of Lot 9 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeasterly terminus of the center line of Easement No. 10 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 465, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 15, 1965, being also a point on the Northwesterly line of land described as Parcel B-20-31 in Quitclaim Deed to Andrew Matto, et al, recorded December 14, 1964 as File/Page No. 226678; thence along the boundary of said land of Matto, et al, as follows: South $40^{\circ}53'52''$ West, 1033.16 feet (record - South $40^{\circ}53'30''$ West, 1033.31 feet) to the most Westerly corner of said land; South $46^{\circ}08'03''$ East, 722.60 feet (record - South $46^{\circ}08'25''$ East, 722.70 feet) to the most Southerly corner of said land; North $50^{\circ}09'37''$ East (record - North $50^{\circ}09'15''$ East), 925.37 feet to the most Easterly corner of said land; North $56^{\circ}54'32''$ West (record - North $56^{\circ}54'50''$ West), 252.51 feet to an angle point therein; North $13^{\circ}39'54''$ West (record - North $13^{\circ}40'16''$ West), 761.53 feet to the most Northerly corner of said land; and South $40^{\circ}53'52''$ West (record - South $40^{\circ}53'30''$ West), 250.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 5 (73-0415):

Those portions of Lots 9 and 10 of the Resubdivision of a part of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, and that portion of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Lucio, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 of San Diego County, filed in said Recorder's office, described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Spring Canyon Road as shown on City Engineer's Drawing No. 11029-1-D filed in the office of the City Engineer of the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, within the center line of Road Easement No. 19 as shown on City Engineer's Drawing No. 12253-1-D filed in the office of said City Engineer; thence along said center line South 64°30'44" East 183.06 feet to the beginning of a tangent 600.00 foot radius curve, concave Southwesterly; thence Southeasterly along the arc of said curve being along said center line through a central angle of 33°01'55" a distance of 345.91 feet; thence leaving said center line North 23°18'19" East 871.07 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence North 14°32'59" East 716.39 feet; thence radially South 76°33'07" East 788.68 feet to an intersection with the center line of Road Easement No. 18 as shown on said City Engineer's Drawing No. 12253-1-D, said intersection being a point on the arc of a 1200.00 foot radius curve, concave Westerly; thence Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, being along said center line through a central angle of 3°55'18" a distance of 82.14 feet; thence tangent and along said center line South 17°22'12" West 702.89 feet to a point which bears South 71°27'13" East from the True Point of Beginning, thence North 71°27'13" West 754.55 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 6: (73-0407):

That portion of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Luco, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 on file in the office of the County Clerk of San Diego County, described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Southeasterly continuation of the center line of Road Easement No. 12 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County May 3, 1966, being a point on the arc of a 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Northeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears South 38°24'16" West, to said point; thence along the continuation of and the center line of said Road Easement No. 12 as follows: Northwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 51°35'06" a distance of 720.50 feet; and tangent to said curve North 00°00'22" East, 268.68 feet to the most Southerly corner of land described as Parcel 165 in deed to Frederick O. Horne, et ux, recorded June 24, 1969 as File/Page No. 112744 and being the True Point of Beginning; thence along the boundary of said Parcel 165 of Horne's land as follows: North 67°04'14" West, 1296.85 feet; North 41°23'02" East, 816.82 feet to the Northerly line of said Lot 73; along said Northerly line South 89°08'54" East, 624.56 feet to the Northerly prolongation of the Westerly line of said Road Easement No. 12; along said prolongation South 00°00'22"

West, 1031.13 feet to the Northwestern corner of said Road Easement No. 12; along the Northerly line of said Road Easement No. 12 South 78°00'38" East, 30.67 feet to the center line of said Road Easement No. 12 and along said center line South 00°00'22" West, 71.32 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Excepting therefrom that portion thereof described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Southeasterly continuation of the center line of Road Easement No. 12 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966, being a point on the arc of a 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Northeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears South 38°24'16" West, to said point; thence along the continuation of and the center line of said Road Easement No. 12 as follows: Northwest along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 51°16'06" a distance of 720.50 feet; and tangent to said curve North 00°00'22" East, 268.68 feet to the most Southerly corner of land described as Parcel 165 in deed to Frederick O. Horne, et ux, recorded June 24, 1969 as File/Page No. 112744; thence along the boundary of said Parcel 165 of Horne's land North 67°04'14" West, 617.53 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said boundary of Parcel 165 of Horne's land as follows: North 67°04'14" West, 679.32 feet North 41°23'02" East, 816.82 feet to the Northerly line of said Lot 73; thence South 89°08'54" East, along said Northerly line 292.37 feet; thence leaving said Northerly line South 13°19'04" West, 897.30 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 7 (73-0409-A1):

That portion of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Lucio, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 on file in the office of the County of Clerk of San Diego County, described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Southeasterly continuation of the center line of Road Easement No. 12 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966, being a point on the arc of a 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Northeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears South 38°24'16" West, to said point; thence along the continuation of and the center line of said Road Easement No. 12 Northwest along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 30°39'00" a distance of 427.96 feet to the most Easterly corner of land described as Parcel 166 in deed to Fernando L. Sola, et al, recorded June 24, 1969 as File/Page No. 112743 in said Recorder's office and being the True

Point of Beginning; thence along the boundary of said Parcel 166 as follows: along the center line of said Road Easement No. 12, continuing Northwesterly and Northerly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $20^{\circ}57'06''$ a distance of 292.54 feet; thence tangent to said curve North $00^{\circ}00'22''$ East, 258.68 feet to the Northeasterly corner of said Parcel 166; thence North $67^{\circ}04'14''$ West, 765.91 feet; thence South $04^{\circ}11'20''$ East, 906.27 feet to the Northerly line of that parcel of land described in deed to the County of San Diego recorded February 8, 1974 as File/Page No. 74-033846 in said Recorder's office; thence along said Northerly line North $85^{\circ}48'34''$ East, 693.86 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 8: (73-0416):

Those portions of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Lucio, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 on file in the office of the County Clerk of San Diego County, and portions of Lots 9 and 10 Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, all being in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, described as a whole as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Southeasterly continuation of the center line of Road Easement No. 12 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966, being a point on the arc of a 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly, in the center line of said Road Easement No. 1, a radial line of said curve bears North $56^{\circ}35'10''$ West to said point; thence along the center line of said Road Easement No. 1 as follows: Southwesterly along the arc of said curve through a central angle of $21^{\circ}44'32''$ a distance of 303.58 feet; and tangent to said curve South $11^{\circ}40'18''$ West, 459.87 feet to the Northeasterly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Robert Newton Hunter, Jr., recorded August 25, 1966 as File/Page No. 139126 and being the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said center line South $11^{\circ}40'18''$ West, 1020.20 feet (deed - 1020.20 feet) to the Easterly prolongation of the center line of Road Easement No. 19 as shown on said Miscellaneous Map No. 488 thence along said prolongation and said center line of Road Easement No. 19 as follows: North $88^{\circ}19'42''$ West, 100.93 feet (deed - 100.91 feet) to the beginning of a tangent 300.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly; and Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $35^{\circ}27'02''$ a distance of 185.62 feet to the most Southerly corner of said Hunter's land; thence along the boundary of said Hunter's land as follows: North $19^{\circ}06'29''$ West, 292.82 feet; and North $72^{\circ}14'44''$ West, 655.87 feet to the center line of Road Easement No. 13 as shown on said Miscellaneous Map

No. 488; thence along said center line as follows: North 17°22'12" East, 702.89 feet to the beginning of a tangent 1200.00 foot radius curve, concave Southwesterly; and Northerly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle 04°39'25" a distance of 97.54 feet to the Northwesterly corner of said Hunter's land; thence along the Northerly line of said Hunter's land South 78°36'44" East, 987.60 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 9 (73-0417):

Those portions of Lots 9 and 10 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Easterly prolongation of the center line of Road Easement No. 19 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966; thence along said prolongation and said center line of Road Easement No. 19 as follows: North 88°19'42" West, 100.93 feet (deed - 100.91 feet) to the beginning of a tangent 300.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly; and Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 35°27'02" a distance of 185.62 feet to the most Easterly corner of land described in Quitclaim to Harry Weimer, recorded September 13, 1966 as File/Page No. 148437 and being the True Point of Beginning; thence along the boundary of said Weimer's land as follows: North 19°05'29" West, 292.82 feet; and North 72°14'44" West, 655.87 feet to the center line of Road Easement No. 18 as shown on said Miscellaneous Map No. 488; thence along said center line South 17°22'12" West, 419.11 feet to the Southwesterly corner of said Weimer's land; thence along the Southwesterly line of said Weimer's land South 56°07'22" East, 780.39 feet to the center line of said Road Easement No. 19; thence along said center line as follows: North 21°18'21" East, 233.95 feet to the beginning of a tangent 300.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly; and Northeasterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 34°54'55" a distance of 182.81 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 10 (73-0419):

Those portions of Lots 9 and 10 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Easterly prolongation of the center line of Road Easement No. 19 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous

Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966; thence along said prolongation and said center line of Road Easement No. 19 as follows: North $88^{\circ}19'42''$ West, 100.93 feet (Deed - 100.91 feet) to the beginning of a tangent 300.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly; Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $70^{\circ}21'57''$ a distance of 368.43 feet; and tangent to said curve South $21^{\circ}18'21''$ West, 233.95 feet to the most Easterly corner of land described in quitclaim Deed to David B. Devine, et al, recorded July 1, 1966 as File/Page No. 108768 and being the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing along said center line as follows: South $21^{\circ}18'21''$ West, 475.67 feet to the beginning of a tangent 500.00 foot radius curve, concave Northwesterly; Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $33^{\circ}52'11''$ a distance of 295.57 feet; tangent to said curve $55^{\circ}10'32''$ West, 260.47 feet to the beginning of a tangent 500.00 foot radius curve, concave Northerly; and Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $40^{\circ}11'07''$ a distance of 350.68 feet to the center line of Road Easement No. 18 as shown on said Miscellaneous Map No. 488; thence along the center line of said Road Easement No. 18 as follows: North $00^{\circ}06'37''$ East, 391.28 feet to the beginning of a tangent 1000.00 foot radius curve, concave Easterly; Northerly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $17^{\circ}15'34''$ a distance of 301.25 feet; and tangent to said curve North $17^{\circ}22'12''$ East, 686.46 feet to the most Northerly corner of said land of Devine, et al; thence along the Northeasterly line of said land South $56^{\circ}07'22''$ East, 780.39 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 11 (73-0410):

Those portions of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Luco, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 on file in the office of the County Clerk of San Diego County, and Lot 9 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, all being in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the Northerly terminus of the center line of Easement No. 12 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 465, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 15, 1965, being also the Northwesterly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Fred Eklund, et al, recorded September 27, 1965 as File/Page No. 175424; thence along the center line of said Easement No. 12 and the Southeasterly continuation thereof as follows: South $00^{\circ}00'22''$ West 340.00 feet to the beginning of a tangent 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Northeasterly; and Southeasterly along the arc of said

curve, through a central angle of $51^{\circ}36'06''$ a distance of 720.50 feet to the center line of Easement No. 1 as shown on said Miscellaneous Map No. 465; being a point on the arc of a 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears North $56^{\circ}35'10''$ West to said point; thence along the center line of said Easement No. 1 as follows: Northeastly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $08^{\circ}13'05''$ a distance of 114.75 feet; non-tangent to said curve North $42^{\circ}31'20''$ East, 528.78 feet, being a point on the arc of a non-tangent 800.00 feet radius curve, concave Southeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears North $48^{\circ}22'05''$ West to said point; and Northeastly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $47^{\circ}25'09''$ a distance of 662.09 feet; thence at right angles to said center line North $00^{\circ}56'56''$ West, 30.00 feet to a corner in the boundary of said land of Eklund, et al; thence along said boundary as follows: South $89^{\circ}03'04''$ West, 398.41 feet to an angle point therein; and North $78^{\circ}00'30''$ West, 936.49 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 12 (73-0413):

That portion of Lot 9 of the Resubdivision of Fanta Ranch, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 10 with the center line of Road Easement No. 1 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 465, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, State of California, February 15, 1965; being on the arc of a 100.00 foot radius curve, concave Northeastly, a radial line of said curve bears South $74^{\circ}23'41''$ West to said point; thence along the continuation of and the center line of said Easement No. 10, Southeastly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $23^{\circ}56'42''$ a distance of 417.92 feet to an angle point in the boundary of Parcel B-151 of Newport's land; thence along the boundary of said Parcel B-151 as follows: North $40^{\circ}53'52''$ East, 220.00 feet; South $13^{\circ}39'54''$ East, 761.58 feet; South $56^{\circ}54'32''$ East, 252.51 feet to an angle point therein; thence North $18^{\circ}03'05''$ West, 1124.78 feet to a point on the center line of Road Easement No. 1; thence along said center line South $89^{\circ}03'04''$ West, 100.00 feet; thence North $03^{\circ}22'21''$ East, 30.08 feet to the Northerly line of said Easement No. 1; thence along the Northerly boundary of said Easement 1 as follows: South $89^{\circ}03'04''$ West, 201.68 feet to the Northwestern corner of said Parcel B-151 of Newport's land; thence South $00^{\circ}56'56''$ East, 30.00 feet to the center line of said Easement No. 1, being a point on the arc of a 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears North $00^{\circ}56'56''$ West to said point; thence along said center line Westerly along the arc of said curve, through a

LAJ-797059.VI

A-9

08/26/77

central angle of $07^{\circ}09'43''$ a distance of 100.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 13 (73-0423):

Those portions of Lots 3 and 4 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 18 with the center line of Road Easement No. 19 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966; thence along the center line of said Road Easement No. 18, South $00^{\circ}06'37''$ West 1149.00 feet to the Southwesterly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Thomas Hunter McManus, Sr., et ux, recorded July 5, 1966 as File/Page No. 109648; thence along the Southerly line of said McManus' land South $76^{\circ}52'37''$ East, 528.31 feet to the Southwesterly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Vernon Lucius Robinson, et ux, recorded July 28, 1966 as File/Page No. 123058 and being the True Point of Beginning; thence along the boundary of said Robinson's land as follows: North $01^{\circ}49'58''$ West 625.32 feet to the most Northerly corner of said land; South $44^{\circ}28'28''$ East, 385.39 feet to an angle point therein; South $80^{\circ}00'26''$ East, 391.23 feet to the center line of Road Easement No. 1 as shown on Miscellaneous Map No. 488; along said center line South $04^{\circ}00'57''$ West, 263 feet; and South $00^{\circ}26'59''$ West, 49.44 feet to the Southeasterly corner of said Robinson's land; thence along the Southerly line of said Robinson's land North $87^{\circ}12'37''$ West, 617.20 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 14 (73-0411):

Those portions of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Luco, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 on file in the office of the County Clerk of San Diego County, and Lots 9 and 10 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, all being in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, and described as a whole as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the Southeasterly continuation of the center line of Road Easement No. 12 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 488, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, May 3, 1966, being a point on the arc of a 800.00

foot radius curve, concave southeasterly, in the center line of said Road Easement No. 1, a radial line of said curve bears North 56°35'10" West to said point; thence along the center line of said Road Easement No. 1 as follows: Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 21°44'32" a distance of 303.58 feet; and tangent to said curve South 11°42'18" West 459.87 feet to the Southeasterly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Conrad B. Walburger, et ux, recorded July 22, 1966 as File/Page No. 119961; thence along the Southerly line of said Walburger's land North 78°36'44" West, 987.6 feet to the center line of Road Easement No. 18 as shown on Miscellaneous Map No. 488, being a point on the arc of a 1200.00 foot radius curve, concave Southwesterly, a radial line of said curve bears South 77°17'14" East to said point; thence along the center line of said Road Easement No. 18, Northwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 39°14'19" a distance of 921.81 feet to the most Westerly corner of said Walburger's land; thence along the Northerly line of said Walburger's land North 85°48'34" East, 1026.35 feet to the center line of said Road Easement No. 12, being a point on the arc of a 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Northeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears South 69°03'16" West to said point; thence along said center line and the continuation thereof Southeasterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of 30°39'00" a distance of 427.96 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 15 (73-0408):

Those portions of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Lucio, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 on file in the office of the County Clerk of San Diego County, and of Lot 9 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, all being in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, and described as a whole as follows:

Beginning at the Northerly terminus of the Westerly line of Easement No. 12 as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 of Miscellaneous Map No. 465, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 15, 1965; thence South 78°00'38" East, 30.67 feet to the Northerly terminus of the center line of said Easement No. 12, being the Northwesterly corner of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Fred Eklund, et al, recorded September 27, 1965 as File/Page No. 175424; thence along the Northerly boundary of said land of Eklund, et al, as follows: South 78°00'38" East, 936.49 feet to an angle point therein, and North 89°03'04" East, 398.41 feet to a corner in the boundary of land described as Parcel B-151 in Quitclaim Deed to James R. Newport, et ux,

recorded August 23, 1965 as File/Page No. 153083; thence along the Northerly line of said land North 89°03'04" East, 201.68 feet to an angle point in the Westerly boundary of land described in Quitclaim Deed to Jeffrian Corporation, et al, recorded August 19, 1965 as File/Page No. 135461; thence along said Northerly boundary as follows: North 03°22'21" East, 425.73 feet to an angle point therein; and North 03°27'27" East, 774.48 feet to the Northerly boundary of said Rancho Mission; thence along said Northerly boundary North 89°08'54" West, 1617.81 feet to the Northerly prolongation of the Westerly line of said Easement No. 12; thence along said prolongation South 00°00'22" West, 1031.13 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 16 (73-0418-A1):

Those portions of Lots 3 and 10 of the Resubdivision of Fanita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, and that portion of Lot 73 of Rancho Mission of San Diego, according to Partition Map thereof made in the action entitled "Juan M. Lucio, et al, vs. The Commercial Bank of San Diego, et al" under Superior Court Case No. 348 on file in the office of the County Clerk of San Diego County, described as follows:

Commencing at the intersection of the center line of Spring Canyon Road as shown on City Engineer's Drawing No. 11029-1-D filed in the office of the City Engineer of the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, with the center line of Road Easement No. 19 as shown on City Engineer's Drawing No. 12253-1-D filed in the office of said City Engineer; thence along said center line South 64°30'44" East 183.00 feet to the beginning of a tangent 600.00 foot radius curve, concave Southwesterly; thence Southeasterly along the arc of said curve, being along said center line, through a central angle of 33°01'55" a distance of 345.91 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence leaving said center line North 23°18'19" East, 871.07 feet; thence South 71°27'13" East, 754.55 feet to the center line of Road Easement No. 18 as shown on said City Engineer's Drawing No. 12253-1-D; thence along said center line South 17°22'12" West, 1105.57 feet to the beginning of a tangent 1000.00 foot radius curve, concave Easterly; thence Southerly along the arc of said curve, being along said center line, through a central angle of 17°15'34" a distance of 301.24 feet; thence tangent to said curve and along said center line South 00°00'37" West, 391.28 feet to an intersection with the center line of said Road Easement No. 19, said intersection being a point on the arc of a 500.00 foot radius curve, concave Northerly whose center bears North 05°21'39" East, thence Northwesterly along the arc of said curve, being along center line, through a central angle of 69°21'14" a distance of 605.23 feet; thence tangent to said curve and along said center line North 15°17'07" West, 686.17 feet to the beginning of a tangent 600.00 foot

LAJ-797069.V1

A-12

08/26/97

radius curve, concave Southwesterly; thence Northwesterly along the arc of said curve, being along center line, through a central angle of $16^{\circ}11'43''$ a distance of 169.60 feet to the True Point of Beginning.

Parcel 17 (73-0412):

That portion of Lot 9 of the Resubdivision of a portion of Panita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to Map thereof No. 1703, filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County, February 28, 1918, described as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of the center line of Road Easement No. 1 with the center line of Road Easement No. 10 as described in that certain Instrument recorded June 7, 1965 as File/Page No. 101350 wherein the City of San Diego was quitclaimed certain road and sewer easements by the United States of America acting by and through the Administrator of General Services, said intersection being a point on the arc of an 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly in the center line of said Road Easement No. 1 a radial line of said curve bears North $08^{\circ}06'39''$ West to said point; thence along the center line of said Road Easement No. 1 as follows: Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $40^{\circ}15'26''$ a distance of 562.09 feet; non-tangent to said curve South $42^{\circ}31'20''$ West 528.78 feet to the beginning of a tangent 800.00 foot radius curve, concave Southeasterly; Southwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $29^{\circ}57'38''$ a distance of 418.33 feet and non-tangent to said curve South $11^{\circ}40'18''$ West, 1698.73 feet to the Southwesterly corner of land described as Parcel B-154 in Quitclaim Deed to Joseph E. Selma, et al, recorded July 30, 1965 as File/Page No. 137214; thence along the boundary of said Parcel B-154 as follows: South $74^{\circ}06'28''$ East, 131.04 feet to an angle point therein; and North $50^{\circ}09'37''$ East, 1670.00 feet to the most Southerly corner of land described as Parcel B-11-31 in Quitclaim Deed to Andrew Matto, et al, recorded December 14, 1964 as File/Page No. 226678; thence along the boundary of said Parcel B-11-31 as follows: North $44^{\circ}08'03''$ West, 722.69 feet (record - North $46^{\circ}08'25''$ West, 711.70 feet) to an angle point therein; and North $40^{\circ}53'52''$ East 1033.16 feet (record - North $40^{\circ}53'30''$ East 1033.31 feet) to the Southeasterly terminus of the center line of said Road Easement No. 10 being a point on the arc of a 1000.00 foot radius curve, concave Northeasterly, a radial line of said curve bears South $50^{\circ}26'59''$ West to said point; thence along said center line, Northwesterly along the arc of said curve, through a central angle of $23^{\circ}56'42''$ a distance of 417.92 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 18 (63-5017):

Those portions of Lots 4 and 9 of the Resubdivision of a part of Panita Rancho, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego,

EXHIBIT B
RIGHT-OF-WAY MAP

EXHIBIT C

FINE MATERIALS CONVEYANCE AREA




EXHIBIT D
GRADING PLAN




EXHIBIT E

FIXED ROYALTY SCHEDULE

	Period Beginning	Period Ending	Proposed Monthly Royalty	Proposed Annual Royalty
Year 1	Jan-07	Dec-07	\$310,147	\$3,721,764
Year 2	Jan-08	Dec-08	\$325,654	\$3,907,852



HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
550 SOUTH HOPE STREET, SUITE 2000
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2627

TEL 213 • 532 • 2000
FAX 213 • 532 • 2020

COLLEEN P. DOYLE
DIRECT DIAL: 213-532-2102
EMAIL: doylec@hunton.com

August 2, 2017

**CONFIDENTIAL AND
TRADE SECRET BUSINESS
INFORMATION ENCLOSED
DO NOT DISTRIBUTE**

VIA E-Mail and Overnight Delivery

Ms. Sarah W. Dunham (Dunham.sarah@Epa.gov)
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
USEPA Headquarters
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Mail Code: 6201A
Washington, D.C. 20460

Re: Lack of Common Control: Hanson Aggregates Pacific Southwest, Inc. and
Sycamore Landfill, Inc. Operations, Santee, California

Dear Ms. Dunham,

I write on behalf of Hanson Aggregates Pacific Southwest, Inc. (“Hanson”) seeking guidance on the San Diego Air Pollution Control District’s (“District”) Title V common control determination for Hanson and Sycamore Landfill, Inc.’s (“SLI”) operations in Santee, California. SLI owns the Santee facility where it operates a Class III solid waste landfill. Through a license agreement with SLI, Hanson conducts aggregate mining at the Santee location.¹ While co-located, SLI and Hanson are independently owned companies with distinctly different operations and emissions. Asserting common control here defies the common sense notion of a plant, and forces a common control interpretation that is “unreasonably inconsistent with its plain meaning.” Summit Petroleum Corp. v. EPA, 690 F.3d 733, 744 (6th Cir. 2012). As outlined below, the goals for aggregating — improving air quality and preventing companies from skirting their regulatory compliance obligations — are not accomplished by combining these two separate operations.

¹ The SLI/Hanson license is memorialized in the Landfill Development Agreement (“License”) and the First Amendment to Landfill Development Agreement (“Amended License”), copies of which are enclosed.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 2

Landfill gas from SLI's landfill operations subjects it to Title V permitting as a major source of VOCs. Absent VOCs, no other pollutant would trigger Title V permitting at SLI's landfill. Hanson's mining operation is not a major source for any air pollutant, and does not emit VOCs from any stationary source. For the last 15 years, the District has regulated Hanson's PM 10 emissions under a permit to operate. Combined, SLI's and Hanson's PM 10 emissions are significantly below the 100 tpy PM 10 major source Title V triggering limit.²

Despite a lack of any major source emissions, whether considered alone or in conjunction with SLI, the District recently determined Hanson's operation is subject to Title V permitting. The District reasons that SLI is subject to Title V (because of triggering VOC levels), and SLI and Hanson are co-located, ergo Hanson's mining operation is subject to Title V permitting.³ The District has requested Hanson submit a Title V permit application and has indicated it intends to issue Hanson a separate Title V permit.

As outlined below, Hanson maintains there is a lack of common control between SLI and Hanson. Because the District's Title V determination for Hanson is based on the facilities' co-location, absent common control, Title V permitting for Hanson's operation is inappropriate.

BACKGROUND

Hanson's Santee mining operation involves rock extraction, crushing and size segregation. Consistent with its District issued permit, Hanson controls PM 10 emissions through water spray systems and baghouse filtration. Hanson's license requires it to provide the labor, equipment, materials and utilities to conduct its mining operation. License § 6.1. Accordingly, Hanson provides the mining and emission control equipment associated with its operation, and only Hanson employees are authorized to use it. The District's permit prohibits anyone other than Hanson from operating the equipment.

² For Title V purposes, it is not appropriate to combine potential fugitive emissions associated with Hanson's and SLI's Santee operations. See 40 CFR § 70.2 (Major Source definition; potential to emit (fugitive emissions) only included for specified sources which do not include landfilling or aggregate mining).

³ The District's position is outlined in the May 2, 2017 correspondence from Paula Forbis, Senior Deputy, County of San Diego, Office of County Counsel to Stephen O'Neil, Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton, a copy of which is enclosed.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 3

SLI utilizes areas mined by Hanson for waste disposal. SLI provides and controls the equipment it uses in landfilling operations, including emission control. SLI's policies and operating procedures prohibit any party other than SLI or its affiliates from operating the landfill gas collection equipment.

DISCUSSION

Title V's definition of major source has three key elements: (i) contiguous or adjacent properties; (ii) the same two digit SIC code; and (iii) common control.⁴ 40 CFR § 70.2; Seneca Energy II, LLC, 2016 WL 7489675, at *6 (U.S. Env'tl. Prot. Agency Dec. 9, 2016) (Order Denying Petition for Objection to Permit) ("Seneca Denial"). It is the absence of common control that precludes Title V permitting for Hanson's operation.

Aggregation needs to be "sufficiently predictable to give plausibly regulated entities 'explicit notice as to whether (and on what statutory authority) the EPA construes the term [stationary source. . .]'" Summit Petroleum 690 F.3d at 747 (citing Alabama Power Co. v. Costle, 633 F.3d 323, 397 (D.C. Cir. 1979)). Recognizing the constraints imposed by Alabama Power, the need to "approximate a common sense notion of 'plant[,] was key to EPA's major source definition. 45 FR 52676, 52695 (Aug. 7, 1980). EPA explicitly wanted to "avoid aggregating pollutant-emitting activities . . . that are ordinarily considered separate." Id.; see also 56 FR 21712, 21724 (EPA's approach to defining major source under Title V "avoids the possibility that dissimilar sources . . . will be considered as the same "source" because of common ownership."))

Combining completely separate landfill and aggregate mining operations defies any common sense notion of a plant. Instead, it improperly aggregates "pollutant-emitting activities . . . that are ordinarily considered separate." 45 FR at 52695. The District cannot override EPA's fundamental rationale for Title V aggregation simply by referencing various provisions of the parties' license agreement.

⁴ While SLI and Hanson have different primary SIC codes, at this time, Hanson is not addressing the District's support facility determination. Accordingly, the SIC code prong is not discussed further.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 4

Except for location, SLI and Hanson do not share operations. Co-location alone, however, is not sufficient to determine common control. At most, it creates “a logical starting point” to analyze the case specific facts. Seneca Denial at 7, 17. As EPA has said repeatedly, common control determinations are made on case-by-case basis, taking into account the specific facts of the case. See e.g., Id. at 7, 14. The circumstances here confirm there is no common control.

There is no overlap in the companies’ workforces, security forces, corporate officers or board members. Likewise, the two companies do not share administrative functions. They have separate payrolls, employee benefits, health plans, retirement funds and insurance coverage. Each company has independent responsibility to comply with applicable environmental laws and obtain the appropriate permits. License §§ 7, 9.3. The companies have separate business and hazardous materials permits and stormwater pollution prevention plans.

As the License Agreement makes clear, the volume of extractable material does not equate to the volume of saleable aggregate. Rather, 40% of the material to be extracted is anticipated to be saleable aggregate, with the remaining 60% classified as “fine material.” Amended License, Amended Recital B. Hanson’s license does not give it ownership interest in the material to be extracted. Rather, title to aggregate transfers upon extraction. Amended License § 5(b). Hanson never has title to the fine material. Rather, Hanson returns the fine material to SLI, who uses it as daily cover in its landfill operations. Contrary to the District’s suggestion, return of earthen material to its rightful owner, for reuse at the facility at which it is located, does not amount to a sharing of intermediaries, products or byproducts. Hanson’s sale of roughly 90% of its mined aggregate to third parties further highlights the separate control of the operations. See e.g., R. Miller Aug. 25, 1999 letter to W. Baumann at 3 (there is no common control between food processor and the co-located power plant when the power plant’s generators only provide 10% of their total output to the food processor).

Aggregating for Title V purposes was intended when “the aggregated activities emit enough pollutants to trigger the applicable emissions thresholds provided in the Act.” 56 FR at 21724. “The purpose of aggregation therefore is simple: ensure actual major sources of pollution are regulated as such to ensure full and adequate protection of air quality, public health and welfare.” Kerr-Mcgee Gathering LLC, 2010 WL 7206738, at *8 (U.S. Env’tl. Prot. Agency Nov. 3, 2010) (Petition to Object to Issuance of a State Title V Operating Permit). Here, aggregating SLI and Hanson neither triggers applicable emissions thresholds nor serves



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 5

the purpose underlying aggregation. The combined operations do not exceed the 100 tpy PM 10 Title V triggering amount. Likewise, aggregating does not change VOC emissions. SLI is a major source for VOCs regardless of Hanson's operation (which do not involve VOC emissions). Moreover, existing air quality permits for both operations "ensure full and adequate protection of air quality, public health and welfare." *Id.* The fact that Hanson's operation is co-located with SLI's is not a sufficient justification to sweep Hanson into Title V permitting.

Importantly, no environmental benefit is gained from requiring Hanson's Santee operation to comply with Title V permitting. EPA adopted the "all-compassing" aggregating approach to protect air quality and "[a] definitional structure that aggregates pollutant-emitting activities into one 'source' would serve that purpose" 45 FR at 52694. EPA also wanted to prevent companies from attempting to shield themselves from major source compliance obligations. See e.g., Oglethorpe Power Co. Wansley Combined Cycle Energy Facility, 2005 WL 6585013 (U.S. Env'tl. Prot. Agency Nov. 14, 2005) (Amended Order Denying Petition for Objection to Permit in Response to Remand) ("The purpose of the "common control" test in defining a major stationary source for permitting purposes is to ensure that sources do not evade major source status (and its more stringent requirements) by artificially sub-dividing sources."). Neither concern is applicable here. The major source concern at the Santee location is VOCs. VOC emissions are directly addressed by SLI's Title V permit. While not sufficient to trigger a major source determination, PM 10 emissions are addressed through SLI's Title V permit and Hanson's District issued permit to operate.

Rather than streamline permitting, imposing Title V permitting on Hanson's operation complicates it. The District and Hanson will expend considerable time, effort and resources on a Title V permit (both in application processing and ongoing recordkeeping and monitoring).

* * * * *

For the reasons outlined above, Hanson appreciates EPA's guidance on the appropriateness of the District's common control determination given the unique facts present here.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 6

Thank you in advance for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Colleen Doyle".

Colleen Doyle

Enclosures (License Agreements; District May 2017 letter)

cc: Mr. Ryan Jackson (Jackson.ryan@Epa.gov)
Ms. Amanda Gunasekara (Gunasekara.mandy@Epa.gov)
Paula Forbis, Esq. (Paula.Forbis@sdcounty.ca.gov)
Mr. Jim Swaney
Mr. Doug Erwin
Ana Damonte, Esq.
Mr. Ian Firth
Mr. Greg Knapp

CBI/Ex. 4



HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
550 SOUTH HOPE STREET, SUITE 2000
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2627

TEL 213 • 532 • 2000
FAX 213 • 532 • 2020

COLLEEN P. DOYLE
DIRECT DIAL: 213-532-2102
EMAIL: doylec@hunton.com

August 2, 2017

**CONFIDENTIAL AND
TRADE SECRET BUSINESS
INFORMATION ENCLOSED
DO NOT DISTRIBUTE**

VIA E-Mail and Overnight Delivery

Ms. Sarah W. Dunham (Dunham.sarah@Epa.gov)
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
USEPA Headquarters
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Mail Code: 6201A
Washington, D.C. 20460

Re: Lack of Common Control: Hanson Aggregates Pacific Southwest, Inc. and
Sycamore Landfill, Inc. Operations, Santee, California

Dear Ms. Dunham,

I write on behalf of Hanson Aggregates Pacific Southwest, Inc. (“Hanson”) seeking guidance on the San Diego Air Pollution Control District’s (“District”) Title V common control determination for Hanson and Sycamore Landfill, Inc.’s (“SLI”) operations in Santee, California. SLI owns the Santee facility where it operates a Class III solid waste landfill. Through a license agreement with SLI, Hanson conducts aggregate mining at the Santee location.¹ While co-located, SLI and Hanson are independently owned companies with distinctly different operations and emissions. Asserting common control here defies the common sense notion of a plant, and forces a common control interpretation that is “unreasonably inconsistent with its plain meaning.” Summit Petroleum Corp. v. EPA, 690 F.3d 733, 744 (6th Cir. 2012). As outlined below, the goals for aggregating — improving air quality and preventing companies from skirting their regulatory compliance obligations — are not accomplished by combining these two separate operations.

¹ The SLI/Hanson license is memorialized in the Landfill Development Agreement (“License”) and the First Amendment to Landfill Development Agreement (“Amended License”), copies of which are enclosed.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 2

Landfill gas from SLI's landfill operations subjects it to Title V permitting as a major source of VOCs. Absent VOCs, no other pollutant would trigger Title V permitting at SLI's landfill. Hanson's mining operation is not a major source for any air pollutant, and does not emit VOCs from any stationary source. For the last 15 years, the District has regulated Hanson's PM 10 emissions under a permit to operate. Combined, SLI's and Hanson's PM 10 emissions are significantly below the 100 tpy PM 10 major source Title V triggering limit.²

Despite a lack of any major source emissions, whether considered alone or in conjunction with SLI, the District recently determined Hanson's operation is subject to Title V permitting. The District reasons that SLI is subject to Title V (because of triggering VOC levels), and SLI and Hanson are co-located, ergo Hanson's mining operation is subject to Title V permitting.³ The District has requested Hanson submit a Title V permit application and has indicated it intends to issue Hanson a separate Title V permit.

As outlined below, Hanson maintains there is a lack of common control between SLI and Hanson. Because the District's Title V determination for Hanson is based on the facilities' co-location, absent common control, Title V permitting for Hanson's operation is inappropriate.

BACKGROUND

Hanson's Santee mining operation involves rock extraction, crushing and size segregation. Consistent with its District issued permit, Hanson controls PM 10 emissions through water spray systems and baghouse filtration. Hanson's license requires it to provide the labor, equipment, materials and utilities to conduct its mining operation. License § 6.1. Accordingly, Hanson provides the mining and emission control equipment associated with its operation, and only Hanson employees are authorized to use it. The District's permit prohibits anyone other than Hanson from operating the equipment.

² For Title V purposes, it is not appropriate to combine potential fugitive emissions associated with Hanson's and SLI's Santee operations. See 40 CFR §70.2 (Major Source definition; potential to emit (fugitive emissions) only included for specified sources which do not include landfilling or aggregate mining).

³ The District's position is outlined in the May 2, 2017 correspondence from Paula Forbis, Senior Deputy, County of San Diego, Office of County Counsel to Stephen O'Neil, Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton, a copy of which is enclosed.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 3

SLI utilizes areas mined by Hanson for waste disposal. SLI provides and controls the equipment it uses in landfilling operations, including emission control. SLI's policies and operating procedures prohibit any party other than SLI or its affiliates from operating the landfill gas collection equipment.

DISCUSSION

Title V's definition of major source has three key elements: (i) contiguous or adjacent properties; (ii) the same two digit SIC code; and (iii) common control.⁴ 40 CFR § 70.2; Seneca Energy II, LLC, 2016 WL 7489675, at *6 (U.S. Env'tl. Prot. Agency Dec. 9, 2016) (Order Denying Petition for Objection to Permit) ("Seneca Denial"). It is the absence of common control that precludes Title V permitting for Hanson's operation.

Aggregation needs to be "sufficiently predictable to give plausibly regulated entities 'explicit notice as to whether (and on what statutory authority) the EPA construes the term [stationary source. . .]'" Summit Petroleum 690 F.3d at 747 (citing Alabama Power Co. v. Costle, 633 F.3d 323, 397 (D.C. Cir. 1979)). Recognizing the constraints imposed by Alabama Power, the need to "approximate a common sense notion of 'plant[,] was key to EPA's major source definition. 45 FR 52676, 52695 (Aug. 7, 1980). EPA explicitly wanted to "avoid aggregating pollutant-emitting activities . . . that are ordinarily considered separate." Id.; see also 56 FR 21712, 21724 (EPA's approach to defining major source under Title V "avoids the possibility that dissimilar sources . . . will be considered as the same "source" because of common ownership."))

Combining completely separate landfill and aggregate mining operations defies any common sense notion of a plant. Instead, it improperly aggregates "pollutant-emitting activities . . . that are ordinarily considered separate." 45 FR at 52695. The District cannot override EPA's fundamental rationale for Title V aggregation simply by referencing various provisions of the parties' license agreement.

⁴ While SLI and Hanson have different primary SIC codes, at this time, Hanson is not addressing the District's support facility determination. Accordingly, the SIC code prong is not discussed further.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 4

Except for location, SLI and Hanson do not share operations. Co-location alone, however, is not sufficient to determine common control. At most, it creates “a logical starting point” to analyze the case specific facts. Seneca Denial at 7, 17. As EPA has said repeatedly, common control determinations are made on case-by-case basis, taking into account the specific facts of the case. See e.g., Id. at 7, 14. The circumstances here confirm there is no common control.

There is no overlap in the companies’ workforces, security forces, corporate officers or board members. Likewise, the two companies do not share administrative functions. They have separate payrolls, employee benefits, health plans, retirement funds and insurance coverage. Each company has independent responsibility to comply with applicable environmental laws and obtain the appropriate permits. License §§ 7, 9.3. The companies have separate business and hazardous materials permits and stormwater pollution prevention plans.

As the License Agreement makes clear, the volume of extractable material does not equate to the volume of saleable aggregate. Rather, 40% of the material to be extracted is anticipated to be saleable aggregate, with the remaining 60% classified as “fine material.” Amended License, Amended Recital B. Hanson’s license does not give it ownership interest in the material to be extracted. Rather, title to aggregate transfers upon extraction. Amended License § 5(b). Hanson never has title to the fine material. Rather, Hanson returns the fine material to SLI, who uses it as daily cover in its landfill operations. Contrary to the District’s suggestion, return of earthen material to its rightful owner, for reuse at the facility at which it is located, does not amount to a sharing of intermediaries, products or byproducts. Hanson’s sale of roughly 90% of its mined aggregate to third parties further highlights the separate control of the operations. See e.g., R. Miller Aug. 25, 1999 letter to W. Baumann at 3 (there is no common control between food processor and the co-located power plant when the power plant’s generators only provide 10% of their total output to the food processor).

Aggregating for Title V purposes was intended when “the aggregated activities emit enough pollutants to trigger the applicable emissions thresholds provided in the Act.” 56 FR at 21724. “The purpose of aggregation therefore is simple: ensure actual major sources of pollution are regulated as such to ensure full and adequate protection of air quality, public health and welfare.” Kerr-Mcgee Gathering LLC, 2010 WL 7206738, at *8 (U.S. Env’tl. Prot. Agency Nov. 3, 2010) (Petition to Object to Issuance of a State Title V Operating Permit). Here, aggregating SLI and Hanson neither triggers applicable emissions thresholds nor serves



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 5

the purpose underlying aggregation. The combined operations do not exceed the 100 tpy PM 10 Title V triggering amount. Likewise, aggregating does not change VOC emissions. SLI is a major source for VOCs regardless of Hanson's operation (which do not involve VOC emissions). Moreover, existing air quality permits for both operations "ensure full and adequate protection of air quality, public health and welfare." *Id.* The fact that Hanson's operation is co-located with SLI's is not a sufficient justification to sweep Hanson into Title V permitting.

Importantly, no environmental benefit is gained from requiring Hanson's Santee operation to comply with Title V permitting. EPA adopted the "all-compassing" aggregating approach to protect air quality and "[a] definitional structure that aggregates pollutant-emitting activities into one 'source' would serve that purpose" 45 FR at 52694. EPA also wanted to prevent companies from attempting to shield themselves from major source compliance obligations. See e.g., Oglethorpe Power Co. Wansley Combined Cycle Energy Facility, 2005 WL 6585013 (U.S. Env'tl. Prot. Agency Nov. 14, 2005) (Amended Order Denying Petition for Objection to Permit in Response to Remand) ("The purpose of the "common control" test in defining a major stationary source for permitting purposes is to ensure that sources do not evade major source status (and its more stringent requirements) by artificially sub-dividing sources."). Neither concern is applicable here. The major source concern at the Santee location is VOCs. VOC emissions are directly addressed by SLI's Title V permit. While not sufficient to trigger a major source determination, PM 10 emissions are addressed through SLI's Title V permit and Hanson's District issued permit to operate.

Rather than streamline permitting, imposing Title V permitting on Hanson's operation complicates it. The District and Hanson will expend considerable time, effort and resources on a Title V permit (both in application processing and ongoing recordkeeping and monitoring).

* * * * *

For the reasons outlined above, Hanson appreciates EPA's guidance on the appropriateness of the District's common control determination given the unique facts present here.



Ms. Sarah Dunham
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Air and Radiation
August 2, 2017
Page 6

Thank you in advance for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Colleen Doyle".

Colleen Doyle

Enclosures (License Agreements; District May 2017 letter)

cc: Mr. Ryan Jackson (Jackson.ryan@Epa.gov)
Ms. Amanda Gunasekara (Gunasekara.mandy@Epa.gov)
Paula Forbis, Esq. (Paula.Forbis@sdcounty.ca.gov)
Mr. Jim Swaney
Mr. Doug Erwin
Ana Damonte, Esq.
Mr. Ian Firth
Mr. Greg Knapp

LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

THIS LANDFILL DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (the "Agreement") is entered into as of December 31, 2006, by and between SOUTH COAST MATERIALS COMPANY, a California corporation ("SCMC"), and SYCAMORE LANDFILL, INC., a California corporation ("SLI") and is made in reference to the following facts and understandings:

RECITALS

A. SLI, an affiliate of Allied Waste Industries, Inc., is a waste services company and owns approximately five hundred twenty (520) acres of property in San Diego, San Diego County, California (the "Property"). SCMC and its affiliates extract, process, sell, and market aggregates in and around San Diego County, California. SLI has identified approximately 324 acres of the Property (the "Property") to be developed as a landfill. The Property is more particularly described on Exhibit A.

B. The parties estimate that there are thirty four million two hundred thousand (34,200,000) cubic yards of material to be extracted from the Property (the "Material"). Of this Material, forty percent (40%) is estimated to be saleable aggregates (the "Aggregates") with the remainder being material that is not saleable aggregates.

C. The parties hold (or will submit and process applications, if necessary, to enable them to hold) the necessary permits, entitlements, and financial assurances (the "Entitlements") for SCMC or a third-party operator to extract and process the Material from the Property (the "Work"). The Entitlements are more particularly described in Section 7.

D. The parties desire to enter into an arrangement whereby SCMC will cause the Material to be removed from the Property over a period of seventeen (17) years in a manner consistent with SLI's needs to develop the Property as a landfill and the Aggregates to be marketed, all pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

E. On December 31, 2002, SCMC and SLI entered into a similar landfill development agreement to remove Material and market Aggregates for Phase I of the Property development. This agreement modifies the original understanding going forward.

AGREEMENTS

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the agreements of the parties hereto, and intending to be legally bound hereby, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. LICENSE.

1.1 Grant of License. SLI, for and in consideration of the royalties, covenants and agreements hereinafter expressed to be paid, kept and performed by SCMC, hereby grants and conveys to SCMC an irrevocable (subject to terms herein) license, for the term set forth herein, for each and all of the following purposes:

(a) The right to extract, process and/or remove all Material from the Property, exclusive as against any other aggregate processor other than any third-party operator hired by SCMC, as provided in Section 6.2;

(b) Subject to the Entitlements and all necessary and required governmental regulations and permits, (i) the right to drill, blast, extract, load, stockpile, crush, screen, mix, and/or process the Aggregates from the Property, exclusive as against any other aggregate processor other than any third-party operator hired by SCMC, as provided in Section 6.2, (ii) the right to construct and operate the necessary rock crushing and other rock processing plants on the Property, exclusive as against any other aggregate processor other than any third-party operator hired by SCMC, as provided in Section 6.2, (iii) the right to stockpile Material, saleable or not, on the Property, exclusive as against any other aggregate processor other than any third-party operator hired by SCMC, as provided in Section 6.2, and (iv) the exclusive right to sell, market, transport, and/or export the Aggregates from the Property.

(c) A non-exclusive limited right of access, ingress, and egress for not more than 380 vehicles per day over the Property for the purposes set forth herein and as shown on the Right-of-Way Map, attached hereto as Exhibit B;

(d) The right to conduct those activities reasonably necessary and related to those expressly stated in this Section 1.1, including those activities necessary to comply with the Entitlements or any other governmental regulations or permits.

1.2 SLI's Development Needs. Notwithstanding the license contained in Section 1.1, the parties acknowledge and agree that while this license is exclusive as against any other aggregate processor other than any third-party operator hired by SCMC, it is not exclusive as to SLI and SLI has the right to (i) access the property to supplement SCMC's work if necessary, including as needed excavation, extraction, drilling, blasting, etc., (ii) place liners in all or a portion of the Property, (iii) stockpile Material, or (iv) do any other activity reasonably necessary for SLI to timely and effectively operate its landfill according to its permits, all as provided in Section 6.2.

1.3 Interest in Real Property. The parties acknowledge and agree that the irrevocable license granted in Section 1.1 is an interest in real property in the nature of a profit à prendre in gross and as such is alienable, subject to Section 10.13, and shall be binding and enforceable as against SLI, its successors and assigns, and subsequent

purchasers and/or encumbrancers of the Property. This interest may be recorded with the County Recorders Office.

1.4 Right of Limited Entry. Nothing herein shall prevent SLI from entering the Property in connection with SLI's landfilling activities, including but not limited to entry to excavate, extract and/or stockpile Material, entry to place liners in all or a portion of the Property, or other necessary activities, all as provided in Section 6.2; provided that SLI gives SCMC prior notice and coordinates such activities with SCMC so as not to interfere with SCMC's operations within the Property.

2. TERM. The initial term of this Agreement shall commence on the date first given above and terminate on December 31, 2023. Subject to an exception granted SCMC pursuant to Section 9.6, SCMC agrees to complete this mining project in 17 years. As provided in Section 9.5, the term may be extended for additional phases on the Property.

3. PAYMENTS BY SCMC.

3.1 Permit Fee. Concurrently with the execution of this Agreement, SCMC shall pay SLI a permit fee in the amount of Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000).

3.2 Fixed Royalty. Fixed royalties shall be paid according to the following terms:

(a) Beginning January 2007, and continuing on a monthly basis for the duration of the Term of this agreement, SCMC shall pay SLI a fixed royalty payment in accordance with Exhibit E attached hereto. Said Exhibit specified the amount of Fixed Royalty to be paid to SLI during the first 24 months. Additional Fixed Royalties shall be paid to SLI in subsequent years throughout the entire Term. Said royalties shall be recalculated every two years using similar terms and conditions of value established during the first two year period, however, using an escalator of not less than 5 % per year for the remainder of the Term.

(b) Said payments are due on or before the 15th day of each month for which a fixed monthly royalty payment is due, beginning January 15, 2007.

3.3 Production Royalty.

(a) Subject to the adjustment provided in Section 3.3(b) or Section 5, SCMC shall pay a royalty of Forty- Six Cents (\$0.46) per ton of Aggregates as a production royalty during the term of this Agreement (as adjusted, the "Production Royalty Rate"). Such royalties are due thirty-five (35) days after the end of the month in which Aggregates are removed from the Property.

(b) Beginning on January 1, 2007, until December 31, 2023, the Production Royalty Rate shall be adjusted in proportion to the greater of (i) the

increase in the CPI (as defined in Section 3.3(c)) or (ii) the increase in the PPI (as defined in Section 3.3(d)), in either case which has occurred during the review period, as the case may be.

(c) The term "CPI" means the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) for San Diego, California, on the basis of 1982-84 = 100. If the format or components of the CPI are materially changed after the execution of this Agreement, the parties shall substitute an index which is published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, or a similar agency, and which in the parties' judgment, is equivalent to the CPI in effect on the date of this Agreement.

(d) The term "PPI" means the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Producer Price Index for Construction sand, gravel, and crushed stone (commodity code 13-21) on the basis of 1982 = 100. If the format or components of the PPI are materially changed after the execution of this Agreement, the parties shall substitute an index which is published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, or a similar agency, and which in the parties' judgment, is equivalent to the PPI in effect on the date of this Agreement.

(e) Beginning January 1, 2008 and for the remainder of the Term, the Production Royalty Rate shall be adjusted in proportion to the greater of (i) the increase in CPI or (ii), the increase in PPI, or (iii) the year over year increase in selling price for all third party Aggregates produced or sold from the property.

3.4 Inspection of Books. SLI, or its authorized agent, shall have the right to inspect and make copies of all records made or kept by SCMC of all Material removed and all Aggregates produced and sold from the Property and SCMC shall have the duty to maintain all such records at its main office, 9229 Harris Plant Road, San Diego, California 92145, or at such other place as SCMC may reasonably designate. Said right of SLI may be exercised at the main office of SCMC or at such other places as SCMC may reasonably designate, at a location within a reasonable proximity from the Property, at all reasonable times and intervals and in such a manner as to not unduly interfere with SCMC's operations. Any and all information obtained by SLI or its authorized agent in connection with the inspection and copying of records of SCMC pursuant to this Section 3 shall at all times be kept in absolute confidence by SLI or such agent and not disseminated to any other party in any form or media, excepting dissemination (i) in litigation among the parties hereto or (ii) to the extent legally compelled by court order or legal process.

3.5 Saleable Aggregates. For clarification, the Production Royalty (Section 3.3) is only paid on Aggregates, which are those aggregates actually separated from the Material extracted from the Property and removed from the Property. Aggregates may not be stockpiled by SCMC in a manner that interferes with SLI operations

4. EXTRACTION FEE. SLI shall pay an Extraction Fee to SCMC of One Dollar and Eighty-five Cents (\$1.85) per cubic yard of Material (saleable or not) excavated by SCMC per month during the term of this Agreement. Said Fee shall be increased by a minimum of 5% per year during the term extraction takes place. Such fee is due thirty-five (35) days after the end of the month in which Material is extracted. This extraction fee shall not be paid to SCMC for any extraction performed by SLI or its subcontractors. To the extent that Material not processed as Aggregates is extracted and the cost to SCMC to move such Material to its ultimate destination is greater than the cost to move Material to SCMC's regular processing site for Aggregates, SLI shall reimburse SCMC for such additional cost.

5. QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF MATERIALS. As stated above in Recital B, the parties estimate that there are thirty four million two hundred thousand (34,200,000) cubic yards of Material to be extracted by SCMC from the Property. Of the Material, forty percent (40%) is estimated to be Aggregates. The parties agree to meet on a (2) two-year basis to share information as to the quantity and quality of materials and to discuss to the extent that Material contains more or less than 40% Aggregate waste, SLI and SCMC shall be entitled to an equitable adjustment of the Production Royalty Rate on a going forward basis.

6. MINING.

6.1 Labor and Equipment. SCMC shall provide all labor, equipment, materials, and utilities to extract the Material and process the Aggregates, either by itself or through a third-party operator approved by SLI, such approval not to be unreasonably withheld. SCMC shall install sufficient equipment to process the Quantity of Material and Aggregates anticipated to be mined during the term. In the event, SLI requires SCMC to relocate any or all of the equipment sooner than January 1, 2022, SLI shall pay for a proratta share of the relocation expenses reduced on a straight-line depreciation over the first fifteen years of the contract period. The parties agree and acknowledge that Hanson Aggregates Pacific Southwest, Inc. ("HAPSW"), an affiliate of SCMC, is an approved third-party operator and no further consent of SLI is needed for HAPSW to perform those duties or undertake those obligations delegated to it by SCMC.

6.2 Mining Plan. As soon as practicable after the execution of this Agreement and from time to time thereafter, SCMC and SLI shall jointly prepare or update, as the case may be, a plan describing the extraction of Material from the Property (the "Mining Plan"). The Mining Plan shall be consistent with SLI's need to have the Property prepared for its eventual use as a landfill and with SCMC's need to extract Aggregates in an efficient manner. On or about September 1st of each year of the Agreement, SLI shall provide SCMC with copies of Landfill development plans detailing the specific location of Landfill development needed for the upcoming calendar year along with the Landfill development progression anticipated over the next five-year period. SLI's plans shall include engineering estimates of Quantities of Material to be removed along with details regarding any and all permit limitation and/or restriction that would impact SCMC'S ability

to perform under this agreement. SLI and SCMC shall agree on a mining plan including Quantities of Material to be extracted during the upcoming calendar year. Any modifications to the plan(s) must be agreed upon by both parties. SCMC shall use the agreed upon mining plan to develop the anticipated Cost of Extraction ("Cost") for removing and processing Material during the upcoming calendar year. Said Cost shall be the sole responsibility of SCMC and shall include cost of transportation and disposal of fines into the Designated Fines Materials Conveyance Area. The Mining Plan may provide for, and nothing in this Agreement shall prohibit, SLI from the following activities: (i) excavation, extraction, drilling, and blasting of Material, (ii) placing liners in all or a portion of the Property, (iii) stockpiling Material, or (iv) doing any other activity reasonably necessary for SLI to timely and effectively operate its landfill according to its permits; provided, however, that (x) SLI will extract Material in such a manner as to preserve the Aggregates for extraction by SCMC at no additional cost to SCMC.

6.3 Removal of Fines. As part of its obligations under this Agreement, SCMC shall convey fine materials to the area designated on Exhibit C (the "Fine Materials Conveyance Area"). By mutual agreement of the parties, the Fine Materials Conveyance Area may be changed as part of updating the Mining Plan pursuant to Section 6.2. SLI shall remove fine materials from SCMC's stockpile located at the Fine Materials Conveyance Area at the discharge point of the conveyor head pulley and shall remove such fine materials at a rate consistent with SCMC's ongoing operations. SLI may request that fine materials be conveyed to a location other than the Fine Materials Conveyance Area. To the extent the location designated by SLI for conveying fine materials results in additional expense to SCMC, SCMC shall inform SLI of SCMC's additional capital costs and operating expenses, plus a reasonable profit margin on the cost of capital (the "SCMC Additional Costs"), and SLI agrees to reimburse SCMC for the SCMC Additional Costs. Such reimbursement may be handled as an adjustment to one (1) or more of the payments provided in Sections 3.2, ~~3~~, and 4. If SLI disputes or objects to the SCMC Additional Costs, SLI at its sole expense shall make its own arrangements to convey the fine materials to the desired location. JPA / 1/27

6.4 Progress Meetings. SCMC and SLI will meet no less than quarterly to review and, as necessary, update the Mining Plan. In addition, both parties shall meet on or before January 1, 2009 and on a minimum two-year interval thereafter to consider the terms and conditions of this agreement. Both parties will review the mining/landfilling schedules along with payment schedules and other pertinent matters relating to the agreement. Any changes to these terms shall be discussed then and modified/reconciled only if approved by both parties.

6.5 Mining Practices. SCMC shall work the Property in a good and workmanlike manner in accordance with accepted mining practices, including compliance with all applicable laws, ordinances, regulations and permits, and in compliance with MSHA, OSHA and Cal-OSHA requirements in addition to any other applicable mining or environmental law applicable to aggregate processing operations being performed on the Property by SCMC or its third-party operator.

6.6 Grading. At the end of the term of this Agreement, SCMC shall deliver to SLI the Property graded to within eighteen (18) inches, plus or minus six (6) inches, of SLI's grading plan previously delivered to SCMC. The grading plan is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

6.7 Weighmaster. The quantity of saleable Aggregates shall be determined by actual weight measured by scales operated by a weighmaster (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§12700 et seq.) employed by SCMC. SLI's right to inspect SCMC's books described in Section 3.4 shall apply to this Section 6.7.

6.8 Extraction Reconciliation. An annual aerial survey will be performed to quantify extraction for purposes of reconciling to the monthly volumes. The cost of the annual aerial survey will be shared equally between SLI and SCMC.

6.9 Community Relations. The parties shall mutually agree upon and establish a community relations program that is similar in scope to the community relations program HAPSW has in place at HAPSW's Carroll Canyon operations. SCMC agrees that it will provide SLI with advance notice of any community relations activities, including any written or verbal community with the public regarding SCMC or its third-party operator's Work on the Property, and shall obtain SLI's approval prior to disseminating any written or verbal communications with the public, including but not limited to public officials, community groups, environmental groups and news organizations.

6.10 Mining Operator Annual Report. If necessary, SCMC shall complete the Annual Report for the State of California Department of Conservation and make payment of annual reporting fees.

6.11 Revegetation and Landscaping. SLI shall be responsible for site reclamation, including revegetation and landscaping. SLI's responsibilities shall extend to compliance with all conditions of approval that apply to site reclamation. In the event SCMC secures additional permits and approvals that require landscaping improvements not contemplated under this agreement, SCMC shall be responsible for installing and maintaining such landscaping improvements.

6.12 Blasting. Should SCMC determine blasting is required, it will be performed at industry standards and in compliance with all laws, rules, regulations and permit requirements, including any mitigation measures required as part of SLI's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program under CEQA. SCMC shall be responsible for securing all necessary approvals and will provide SLI notice at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to blasting.

6.13 Repair and Restoration. Within ninety (90) days following completion of the Work on the final phase at the Property, SCMC shall restore the surface of the Property on which its equipment was stored or on which any structure was built or placed

on the Property by or on behalf of SCMC or its third-party operator to the condition it was in prior to the commencement of the Work, at SCMC's sole cost and expense. Said closure related activity shall include the removal of all processing equipment, stockpiles, foundations, and wiring from conduit, including any asbestos containing materials.

6.14 SLI Aggregate Needs. SLI anticipates purchasing in excess of 200,000 cubic yards of suitable Aggregate for purposes of constructing Landfill on the Property. SCMC agrees to provide SLI with the above-quantity and quality of Aggregate at a "best customer class" rate.

6.15 SCMC Disposal/Needs. In the event SCMC requires waste disposal services on the Property, SLI shall provide such services at a comparable discounted rate.

7. ENTITLEMENTS.

7.1 SCMC's Permits. SCMC, at its sole expense, has obtained or shall obtain the following permits related to its operation at the Property:

- (a) Business license;
- (b) Air permit;
- (c) Storm water permit;
- (d) Waste Discharge Requirement Order; and
- (e) Health permit.

7.2 SLI's Permits. SLI, at its sole expense, has obtained or shall obtain the following permits related to the Property, or demonstrate an exemption:

(a) A Community Plan Amendment/Site Development Permit/Planned Development Permit/Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Boundary Adjustment LDR 40-0765 (the "City Approvals");

(b) A Section 1603 Streambed Alteration Permit from the California Department of Fish and Game; and

(c) Except as otherwise provided, all other Entitlements related to the Property and the transaction contemplated by this Agreement.

7.3 SMARA. If the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (Cal. Pub. Resources Code §§2710 et seq.) Applies to SCMC's activities on the Property, the parties agree that SLI shall process the application required by such act with expenses to be paid by SCMC.

7.4 Compliance with Law. The parties shall comply with all Federal, State and local statutes, ordinances, resolutions, mandates, orders, plans, regulations, guidelines, decisions or other administrative, legislative, judicial or executive rules governing their respective operations on the Property.

8. INDEMNITY; INSURANCE.

8.1 SCMC's Indemnity. SCMC, for itself, its successors and assigns, agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless SLI, SLI's successors and assigns, and SLI's agents, officers, directors, stockholders, servants and employees, from and against any and all claims, demands, damages, actions or causes of action at law or in equity, together with any and all losses, costs or expenses and attorneys' fees, in connection therewith or related thereto, for bodily injuries, death or property damage arising or in any matter growing out of the acts or omissions of SCMC, SCMC's employees, agents, contractors, subcontractors or other representatives.

8.2 SLI's Indemnity. SLI, for itself, its successors and assigns, agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless SCMC, SCMC's successors and assigns, and SCMC's agents, officers, directors, stockholders, servants and employees, from and against any and all claims, demands, damages, actions or causes of action at law or in equity, together with any and all losses, costs or expenses and attorneys' fees, in connection therewith or related thereto, for bodily injuries, death or property damage arising or in any matter growing out of the acts or omissions of SLI, SLI's employees, agents, contractors, subcontractors or other representatives.

8.3 SCMC's Liability Insurance. SCMC shall, at SCMC's sole cost, keep in force during the term of this Agreement a policy of commercial general liability insurance covering property damage and liability for personal injury occurring on or about the Property, with limits in the amount of at least Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000) general aggregate, Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) per occurrence for injuries to or death of person, property damage, and with a contractual liability endorsement insuring SCMC's performance of SCMC's indemnity obligations of this Agreement. SCMC shall provide SLI with evidence of coverage within three (3) business days of SLI's request.

8.4 SLI Liability Insurance. SLI shall, at SLI's sole cost, keep in force during the term of this Agreement a policy of commercial general liability insurance covering property damage and liability for personal injury occurring on or about the Property, with limits in the amount of at least Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000) general aggregate, Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) per occurrence for injuries to or death of person, property damage, and with a contractual liability endorsement insuring SLI's performance of SLI's indemnity obligations of this Agreement. SLI shall provide SCMC with evidence of coverage within three (3) business days of SCMC's request.

8.5 Workers' Compensation Insurance. SCMC shall maintain workers' compensation insurance in the amount required by law.

8.6 Waiver of Subrogation. SLI and SCMC each hereby waives any and all rights of recovery against the other, and against the partners, members, shareholders, directors, officers, employees, agents and representatives of the other, for loss of or damage to the property of a party or injury to a person to the extent such damage or injury is covered by proceeds received under any insurance policy carried by SLI or SCMC in force at the time of such loss or damage.

9. ADDITIONAL TERMS.

9.1 Liens and Notices of Non-responsibility. SCMC agrees to keep the Property at all times free and clear of all liens, charges and encumbrances of any and every nature and description done, made or caused by SCMC, and to pay all indebtedness and liabilities incurred by or for SCMC which may or might become a lien, charge or encumbrance; except that SCMC need not discharge or release any such lien, charge or encumbrance so long as SCMC disputes or contests the lien, charge or encumbrance and posts a bond sufficient to discharge such lien acceptable to SLI. Subject to SCMC's right to post a bond in accordance with the foregoing, if SCMC does not within thirty (30) days following the imposition of any such lien, charge or encumbrance, cause the same to be released of record, SLI shall have, in addition to SLI's contractual and legal remedies, the right, but not the obligation, to cause the lien to be released by such manner as SLI deems proper, including payment of the claim giving rise to such lien, charge or encumbrance. All sums paid by SLI for and all expenses incurred by it in connection with such purpose shall be payable by SCMC to SLI on demand with interest at twelve percent (12%) per annum starting from the date due until paid in full.

9.2 Taxes. SLI shall pay any and all taxes assessed and due against the Property before and after execution of this Agreement. SLI shall not be liable for any taxes levied on or measured by income or proceeds, or other taxes applicable to SCMC, based on payments under this Agreement or based upon the severance or production of Aggregates by SCMC from the Property. If there is an increase in real property taxes due to the granting of an exclusive license to SCMC for mining aggregates, the parties agree to share payment of such increase in an equitable manner.

9.3 Environmental Protection. SCMC shall take all reasonable precautions to prevent the improper disposal or release of hazardous wastes and the pollution of air and water by SCMC's operations. Any facilities for employees established on the Property shall be operated in a sanitary manner. It shall be SCMC's sole responsibility to comply with all applicable environmental laws or regulations, subject to SCMC's right to contest the same. If SLI finds physical evidence that air, land, water quality, or other environmental damage has occurred or is about to occur due to SCMC's non-compliance with said environmental laws or regulations, SLI shall have the right, upon written notice to SCMC, to require SCMC or its contractors, agents, or assigns to cease, alter, or modify

immediately that portion of operations on the Property which is causing or is about to cause such air, land, water quality, or other environmental damage; and to direct SCMC in writing to take immediate action to correct or eliminate said damage or threat thereof. SCMC shall then, in consultation with SLI, review the operations to determine if additional actions are necessary to correct or eliminate such damage or threat and shall correct or eliminate the damage or threatened damage immediately, as may be required by SLI or any governmental agency. SLI's rights under this provision shall not release SCMC of its obligations hereunder, nor shall they constitute a waiver of SLI's rights as provided by this Agreement and/or by law. SLI shall be under no obligation to provide for any inspections as to environmental practices of SCMC or to take any responsibility whatsoever for SCMC's actions, it being agreed that compliance therefor is the sole responsibility of SCMC. Liability for any environmental or water quality damage that is caused by SCMC or its contractors, agents, or assigns, shall be borne by and at the sole expense of SCMC, which will be paid immediately upon demand. If SCMC fails or refuses to correct or repair within a reasonable time any environmental damage caused by SCMC's failure to comply with applicable laws or with any obligation or covenant of this Agreement after being directed to do so, then SLI shall have the right to contract with any qualified party to correct said condition, and SCMC shall pay to SLI on demand for all costs, including attorney's fees, of said correction or repair. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, SCMC shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless SLI from any and all losses, damages, expenses, claims, demands, and civil or criminal liabilities or penalties; clean-up lawsuits and other proceedings; and all costs and expenses including damages, attorneys' fees, and disbursements which accrue to or are incurred by SLI, arising directly or indirectly from, or out of, or which are in any way connected with SCMC's acts or omissions which cause environmental or water quality damage as defined by noncompliance with federal, state or local regulations, orders, or laws; or which cause losses, damages, expenses, claims, demands, or civil or criminal penalties or sanctions to be incurred. SCMC agrees to store, transport, and dispose of any hazardous substances, and all hazardous wastes, as defined by any applicable state or federal law, in accordance with all local, state, and federal laws, including the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, as amended ("CERCLA"), regarding the same. SCMC shall not dispose of any hazardous wastes upon the Property. Further, SLI and SCMC acknowledge and agree that in the event mining wastes are regulated by CERCLA, or by any other statute, SCMC may dispose of such wastes on the Property provided SCMC complies fully with such laws and shall be solely responsible for any contamination or other environmental damage found on the Property resulting from SCMC's operations, including the cost of clean-up. At the end of each year, SCMC shall notify SLI of all hazardous substances and hazardous wastes and the quantities brought to, stored upon, used on, or transported from the Property. The provisions of this Section 9.3 are in addition to the other provisions of this Agreement and shall survive any termination or expiration of this Agreement.

9.4 Corporate Guarantees. Either party may request a guarantee from an affiliated corporation of the other party, such request not to be unreasonably refused.

9.5 Renewal for Additional Phases. As additional consideration to SCMC for its obligations under this Agreement, SLI hereby grants SCMC the exclusive right of first refusal to renew this Agreement on substantially similar terms for additional Materials of the Property beyond the Quantity described in Section 5.

9.6 Time Obligations. Time is of the essence in the performance of the obligations of this Agreement and is expected to be completed by SCMC in 17 years. The party responsible for performance of an obligation under this Agreement shall commence performance and thereafter diligently proceed with performance thereof to completion according to the timetables set forth herein. However, if a party is delayed in the performance of its obligation(s) hereunder by reason of, and only by reason of: (i) failure of the other party to perform its obligations contained herein by the time or times required (including any applicable cure periods); (ii) unusual or extreme weather, such as a 100-year flood event; (iii) war; (iv) acts of God; (v) governmental moratoria; (vi) insurrection; or (vii) labor disputes not in violation of any project labor agreement or similar agreement; then the time for completion of the performance shall be extended for a period equal to the length of such delay, if:

(a) Within the earlier of (i) three (3) calendar days after the party who asserts its performance is being delayed ("Promisor") becomes aware of such delay, and (ii) ten (10) calendar days after Promisor should have become aware of such delay through the exercise of reasonable diligence, Promisor gives notice in writing of the event causing such delay;

(b) Within 10 calendar days after the cessation of the event causing such delay, Promisor provides written notice to the other party of the duration of the delay and the corresponding extension request by Promisor, and describing such event, as well as how such event will affect the critical path for completion of the performance being delayed; and

(c) Promisor provides evidence to the reasonable satisfaction of the other party that such event delayed a portion of the work in the critical path and the duration of such delay.

9.7 SCMC Default.

(a) The occurrence of any of the following shall constitute a SCMC event of default (an "SCMC Event of Default"):

(1) The insolvency of SCMC or HAPSW;

(2) The filing of a voluntary petition in bankruptcy or any similar proceeding against SCMC or HAPSW;

(3) Filing of any involuntary petition in bankruptcy or any similar proceeding against SCMC or HAPSW which is not dismissed within sixty (60) days;

(4) Appointment of a receiver or trustee for SCMC or HAPSW which is not dismissed within sixty (60) days;

(5) Execution by SCMC or HAPSW of any assignment of all or any portion of its rights or obligations hereunder in violation of the provisions of this Agreement;

(6) Failure to commence the Work to be performed by SCMC or HAPSW as set forth in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement;

(7) Failure to prosecute the Work to completion in a diligent, efficient, workmanlike, skillful and careful manner in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement;

(8) Failure to pay required taxes when due (except that SCMC may delay payment thereof pending resolution of a legitimate dispute with respect to such taxes);

(9) Failure to maintain required insurance;

(10) Failure to perform any of its material obligations under this Agreement; or

(11) Repudiation or breach of any of the terms of this Agreement.

(b) An SCMC Event of Default shall not be deemed to have occurred if (i) such default is a default involving the payment of money and SCMC cures such event within a period of ten (10) days after receipt of written notice from SLI specifying the SCMC Event of Default; or (ii) such default involves a non-monetary obligation of the SCMC and SCMC commences a cure of such event within a period of ten (10) days after receipt of written notice from SLI specifying the SCMC Event of Default and thereafter diligently pursues such cure to completion in accordance with a schedule reasonably acceptable to SLI.

(c) Upon the occurrence of an SCMC Event of Default, SLI shall make every reasonable effort to mitigate its losses and damages hereunder. SLI shall retain all sums of money theretofore paid hereunder to SLI, and SCMC shall pay to SLI a sum of money equal to the cost of the Work for all Work performed hereunder by SCMC for which payments have not theretofore been made hereunder. SLI's only remedies for an SCMC Event of Default shall be those that are expressly set forth in this Agreement.

9.8 SLI Default.

(a) The occurrence of any of the following shall constitute a SLI event of default (an "SLI Event of Default"):

- (1) The insolvency of SLI;
- (2) The filing of a voluntary petition in bankruptcy or any similar proceeding against SLI;
- (3) Filing of any involuntary petition in bankruptcy or any similar proceeding against SLI which is not dismissed within sixty (60) days;
- (4) Appointment of a receiver or trustee for SLI which is not dismissed within sixty (60) days;
- (5) Execution by SLI of any assignment of all or any portion of its rights or obligations hereunder in violation of the provisions of this Agreement;
- (6) Failure to pay required taxes when due (except that SLI may delay payment thereof pending resolution of a legitimate dispute with respect to such taxes);
- (7) Failure to maintain required insurance;
- (8) Failure to perform any of its material obligations under this Agreement; or
- (9) Repudiation or breach of any of the terms of this Agreement.

(b) An SLI Event of Default shall not be deemed to have occurred if (i) such default is a default involving the payment of money and SLI cures such event within a period of ten (10) days after receipt of written notice from SCMC specifying the SLI Event of Default; or (ii) such default involves a non-monetary obligation of the SLI and SLI commences a cure of such event within a period of ten (10) days after receipt of written notice from SCMC specifying the SLI Event of Default and thereafter diligently pursues such cure to completion in accordance with a schedule reasonably acceptable to SCMC.

(c) Upon the occurrence of an SLI Event of Default, SCMC immediately shall terminate performance of the Work and make every reasonable effort to mitigate its losses and damages hereunder; provided, however, in connection with such termination SCMC shall perform such acts as may be necessary to preserve and protect that part of the Work theretofore performed hereunder. SCMC shall retain all sums of money theretofore paid hereunder to SCMC, and SLI shall pay to SCMC a sum of money

equal to the cost of the Work for all Work performed hereunder by SCMC for which payments have not theretofore been made hereunder and costs of shut-down and demobilization. SCMC's only remedies for an SLI Event of Default shall be those that are expressly set forth in this Agreement.

9.9 Condemnation. If any part of the Property is condemned or otherwise taken under the power of eminent domain or conveyed in lieu of condemnation, SLI shall receive a portion of the award that may be paid in connection with any condemnation or taking of the fee interest in the Property and SCMC shall also receive a portion of the award representing the value of the unexpired term of this Agreement, if any. In addition, if any part of the Property is condemned or otherwise taken under the power of eminent domain or conveyed in lieu of condemnation, and the condemnation or taking materially and adversely affects SCMC's occupancy of the Property, SCMC shall have the right to terminate this Agreement.

10. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

10.1 Successors and Assigns. The terms, provisions and conditions of this Agreement as set forth herein shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of the parties and their respective heirs, personal representatives, successors and assigns.

10.2 Counterpart or Duplicate Copies. This Agreement may be signed in counterpart or duplicate copies and any signed counterpart or duplicate copy shall be equivalent to a signed original for all purposes.

10.3 Execution of Additional Instruments. Each of the parties shall hereafter execute all documents and do all acts necessary, or reasonable in the opinion of any other party, to effect the provisions of this Agreement.

10.4 Entire Agreement. This Agreement contains the entire understanding and agreement between the parties and supersedes any prior understandings and agreements between them respecting the within subject matter.

10.5 Amendments. This Agreement may be altered or amended in whole or in part at any time by writing signed by all the parties.

10.6 Waivers. A waiver by any party of any breach of any of the provisions of this Agreement shall not constitute a continuing waiver or a waiver of any subsequent breach by the breaching party either of the same or of another provision of this Agreement.

10.7 Governing Law. The laws of the State of California shall govern this Agreement.

10.8 Severability. If any term or provision of this Agreement, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, shall to any extent be found to be invalid,

void or unenforceable, the remaining provisions and any application thereof shall, nevertheless, continue in full force and effect without being impaired or invalidated in any way.

10.9 Notices. All notices or other communications required or permitted hereunder shall be in writing, and shall be personally delivered or sent by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested, and shall be deemed received upon the earlier of (i) the date of delivery to the address of the person to receive such notice at the following addresses as evidenced by the execution of the return receipt, or (ii) Three (3) business days after the date of posting by the United States Post Office:

To SLI Sycamore Landfill, Inc.
8514 Mast Blvd.
Santee, CA 92071
Attn.: Neil Mohr

With a copy to: Allied Waste Services, Inc.
8364 Clairemont Mesa Blvd.
San Diego, CA 92111
Attn.: Jim Ambroso

To SCMC South Coast Materials Company
Post Office Box 639069
San Diego, CA 92163
Attn.: President

With a copy to: Hanson Building Materials America, Inc.
300 East John Carpenter Freeway, Suite 1645
Irving, Texas 75062
Attn.: General Counsel

Notice of change of address shall be given by written notice in the manner detailed in this Section 10.9.

10.10 Attorneys' Fees. In the event that any party brings any action or files any proceeding in connection with the enforcement of its respective rights under this Agreement, or as a consequence of any breach by any party of its obligations hereunder, the prevailing party in such action or proceeding shall be entitled to have all of its attorneys' fees and out-of-pocket expenditures paid by the losing party. As used herein, the term "prevailing party" shall mean the party to a suit who successfully prosecutes an action or successfully defends against it.

10.11 Recitals, Captions and Headings. The recitals of this Agreement are incorporated as part of this Agreement. The subject headings of the sections contained herein are inserted as a matter of convenience and for reference, and in no way define,